

COUNCIL MINUTES
TIGARD CITY COUNCIL MEETING
November 16, 2004

Mayor Dirksen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call: Mayor Dirksen, Councilors Moore, Sherwood, Wilson, and Woodruff were present.

1.4 Council Communications & Liaison Reports

1.5 Call to Council and Staff for Non Agenda Items

2. CITY OF TIGARD'S TREE BOARD ANNUAL REPORT – FY 2003-2004

- Staff Report

Staff present included Dennis Koellermeier, Public Works Director, Matt Stine, City Forester, Jim Hendryx, Community Development Director, and Dick Brewersdorff, Current Planning Manager; Tree Board members present included Janet Gillis, Chair; Bob Tinnin, Rob Callen, and Bill Haack.

Mr. Koellermeier presented the staff report including a PowerPoint presentation (Agenda Item #2, Exhibit #1, copy of which is on file with the City Recorder). Mr. Stine reviewed the requirements for cities to qualify for the Tree City USA Growth Award program.

Mr. Hendryx noted community members have indicated their concerns about the Tree Code and Tree Standards, relating to code enforcement as well as development. Staff and the Tree Board have been working together on possible amendments to the code and procedures. Mr. Brewersdorff noted staff concerns about Ballot Measure 37 impacts. He then reviewed the history of Tigard's tree code program since 1992.

Ms. Gillis explained the Tree Board has been working on the Tree Removal portion of the code and still needs to review details relating to mitigation. Some of the details that have been addressed include:

- Creating a credit to developers who retain trees between 6 and 12 inches in diameter, a change from current practice applying to trees 12 inches or larger;
- Fines for tree removal as well as cost to collect the fines;
- In lieu of fees relating to tree mitigation requirements;

- Tree protection measures that would hold developers more accountable if and when tree protection measures are moot or modified with approval by the project arborist and/or the City Forester;
- Encourage creative solutions for builders so they will be able to work within the Code;
- A proposal to create a heritage tree program is currently being reviewed by the Public Works staff; and
- Resolution of Chapter 18 issues has not been reached, but this is scheduled for the Tree Board's December meeting. If approved, the matter will be forwarded to the Public Works Department for their review.

Mr. Tinnin pointed out the Tree Board would like the Planning Commission and Council to be able to review the proposed changes soon, but noted there are some contentious issues yet to be addressed. The Board purposely has tried to reach all sides of these issues before forwarding the issue for hearing. Councilor Woodruff acknowledged the Tree Board's work of trying to weigh in on those issues.

Mr. Callen explained the Board has wrestled with concerns that the code not be punitive, but instead require mitigation measures so there is a positive program.

Councilor Wilson asked if the issue of registered woodlot exceptions were addressed. Mr. Hendryx commented that issue would be on Council's agenda on November 23. A number of wooded lots that are in the deferral program have been recently logged. The intent is the Tree Board recommendations will first be presented to the Planning Commission, and then to Council for ultimate action on the code amendment. The recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning Commission when the Tree Board's work is complete.

Mr. Koellermeier noted the work is also complicated by the impacts of Ballot Measure 37, which staff will continue to sort out. Councilor Wilson urged staff not to allow those issues to deter the process. If property is sold, Ballot Measure 37 does not apply. Mr. Stine noted Julia Hadjuk, Long Range Planner, will be speaking at the Tree Board's December meeting about impacts of Ballot Measure 37 as well as Goal 5.

ITEM NO. 4 WAS TAKEN OUT OF TURN AT THIS TIME.

3. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE UPDATE

- Staff Report

Mr. Hendryx explained Council established this committee in January 2004 to review and possibly recommend changes to the Planned Development section of the Community Development Code. Prior to creating this committee, Council heard lots of concerns about the planned development provisions, density issues, and impacts from several controversial projects. He noted Associate Planner Morgan Tracy and Planning Manager Dick Brewersdorff have worked with the Committee.

Mr. Tracy introduced members of the Task Force who were present: Alice Ellis Gaut, Gretchen Buehner, John Frewing, Sue Beilke, and Charles Schwartz.

Mr. Tracy presented an overview of the issues as well as the topics reviewed at each of the Committee meetings. He noted this issue also has impacts from Ballot Measure 37. The Committee discussed whether to stop their review based on the problems created by Ballot Measure 37. The Committee and staff had created a rough draft of a new ordinance and requested input from the Council on the issue of Open Space Preservation:

- There are potential takings claims if not implemented fairly and properly.
- The Committee discussed an open space acquisition bond effort.
- Is open space an issue Council would like standards developed for in the Planned Development process that would be augmented with bond money, or should the City continue to accept open space voluntarily which are usually located in areas reserved for sensitive land resources.
- How is open space acquired or preserved through the planned development process?

Councilor Moore noted each planned development is going to be different and he did not know if new code provisions could be written that will address all circumstances. He asked staff if a proposal was going to be submitted to Council for its review. Mr. Tracy responded that was staff's and the Committee's intent, even though the resolution that created the Committee did not include any direction.

Councilor Wilson responded he was not advocating for any changes. He noted the current Planned Development process is voluntary and most developers would use the easier regular subdivision process. One reason for requesting this review was that neighbors often complained about the densities on adjacent properties were higher than expected. His sister owns property next to a development where the lot sizes were expected to be 6,000 square feet, but the lots ended up being 3,000 square feet, resulting in much higher densities and affected her privacy.

There are concerns that if such a high density is proposed, the development should include a buffer of open space.

Ms. Beilke noted at their last meeting, the Committee discussed how the Planned Development Code could include having an incentive in exchange for smaller lots, allowing a density bonus such as a playground for the development, or including other alternatives in the code.

Ms. Buehner pointed out that developers' use planned developments voluntarily for a variety of reasons: small acreage, difficulties with the location such as steep slopes, private street and right-of-way issues, or sensitive lands. For one reason or another, they are unable to use standard rules for development. The Committee discussed the possibility of coming up with two classifications, one to follow a general rule and the other addressing multi- or mixed use development, or addressing infill problems. Most developments will be small in size where there is not a lot of flexibility for developments.

Councilor Wilson responded he felt the planned developments would generally be used when a developer cannot use standard subdivision guidelines, or wants a different density than allowed under the current zoning. Other developments may not be economically feasible. He asked if these types of tight developments were so controversial to allow the higher density. He noted that one of the last applications he considered as a member of the Planning Commission was the Blue Heron Development, which was denied because the Planning Commission felt the proposed density was too tight. Citizens from all over the City felt that way as well.

Mr. Frewing noted the Committee has discussed the density question and the question of trading lower density in one area for a higher density in another, while still meeting the overall Metro density requirement. It is not known whether Tigard is on track of meeting its density guidelines. Julia Hadjuk has briefed the Council about conducting a buildable lands inventory and densities which are urgently needed to determine whether lower densities could be allowed in some areas. The Committee discussed developments built in the last five years, which he did not feel was very distinctive. They also discussed creating a list of tools or ideas the Planning Commission could consider when planned developments are proposed, to allow some flexibility.

Mr. Tracy noted some basic tools needed to be developed for the Planning Commission when they consider planned developments. Mayor Dirksen asked if that would be allowed under State land use laws.

Mr. Brewersdorff noted any changes would be tested under the stricter Ballot Measure 37 criteria. In addition, Measure 56 requires notification to affected property owners when code changes might change property values, but the City has not budgeted funds to send notices to all affected property owners Citywide. Staff will be faced with some big issues, and will have to look to see what can be done, changing the pre-application process and questioning applicants about their proposal, requiring applicants to provide more information, and challenging applicants to do some other treatment of trees, open space, etc. Staff is not downplaying the significance of Ballot Measure 37 or the costs, and will be sitting down with the City Attorney's staff to work on proposed changes. The staff hopes the Legislature will make some changes to Ballot Measure 37.

Councilor Woodruff noted at the Joint Meeting with the City of Tualatin City Council and the Tigard/Tualatin School District Board, Legislators talked about Ballot Measure 37 and advised local governments to proceed as much as possible without worrying about possible claims under Ballot Measure 37, and not to stop their planning process. The Legislators also noted they did not anticipate making many changes or adjustments to the law.

Councilor Wilson noted there would be essentially a two-year time period for property owners to file claims under Ballot Measure 37, and then he did not believe the City would have to worry about impacts on someone's property rights.

Ms. Ellis Gaut said some developers would say they cannot use the straight subdivision standards and come in with a planned development in order to have higher density. She felt it would be a grave mistake for Tigard, as well as other municipalities, to stop planning for the future because we don't know what the impacts might be. It would be a grave mistake to believe everything that is done will cause property values to be lowered, whereas restrictions might actually enhance value, not just of the bare land, but the value of the buildings that were put on the land.

Mayor Dirksen thanked Ms. Ellis Gaut for making that statement. Every concept mentioned is worthy of consideration. He noted Ms. Beilke mentioned allowing open space in planned developments to be used by residents of that small community; he thought this was one of the original purposes of planned developments in the first place. In addition, Ms. Buehner's proposal of having two different kinds of planned development is worthy of consideration.

Ms. Beilke stated another proposal would be to encourage builders to use more recycled products, and that Portland was a leader in the field of encouraging use of green products in developments. Mayor Dirksen noted builders would need an

incentive to use green products because use of green products would add to the cost of development.

Councilor Wilson pointed out new developments need to be good neighbors and should mitigate impacts on their neighbors.

Ms. Buehner noted the standards are pretty cut and dried; and a carrot rather than a stick approach would be more effective with developers. It would be better if builders would take ideas such as green streets or changing the building pad that would allow effective development, especially on difficult sites, such as on hillsides or next to wetlands. Her interest was also to amend the code to maximize carrots with the minimum amount of damage to the overall livability and not have competing codes, and also allowing the Planning Commission the ability to approve more creative development. The Planning Commission has some flexibility to mandate certain kinds of things. If a developer wants to add density, she asked what the City is getting in exchange.

Ms. Ellis Gaut noted that if a developer is encouraged to build a green development for example, which then becomes a model for other projects, the project becomes great advertising for the developer, enhances their business reputation, but it also involved education and shifting of conscience-ness by the building industry. The City could possibly catch the wave of green development if the City is determined to make that work, and also to present these proposals in terms of developers making a real contribution and significant mark in their industry as well as this community.

Mr. Tracy noted regulations are a good place to start, but there also needs to be community recognition as well as giving the Planning Commission the tools that support allowing those change to occur.

Mr. Brewersdorff asked how this Committee, as well as the Tree Board, could test their ideas before submitting proposed changes at a Planning Commission or Council hearing. There is going to be mixed feedback from the community. Could either of these groups test the proposals out before the issue is scheduled for a public hearing. If the first hearing on the concept were not until it reaches the Planning Commission and there is a huge outcry of objection, the tendency would be to go back to square one. He suggested that staff, Council and each of these boards consider a way to test the provisions before submitting them to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Frewing suggested a survey either on the website or in *Cityscape* before scheduling a hearing by the Planning Commission.

Mayor Dirksen suggested using a process the Downtown Task Force utilized, and that was the charette process where the group holds a series of neighborhood public meetings, and ask for suggestions from citizens on how they would like this handled. Sometimes it is better to ask for input from impacted citizens or groups about what they don't like rather than pointing out what they do like. Councilor Wilson said it might be easier to get comments from developers rather than from the average neighborhood citizen about development issues. Councilor Moore indicated many citizens would not comment unless a proposed development directly affects them.

Councilor Wilson suggested most citizens do not have any experience with development or care about a development until it occurs on property next to them. He thought the best place to consider this would be at the Planning Commission level, to look at the rules as well as recall what development were controversial in the past, and then apply those cases to hypothetical developments.

Ms. Ellis Gaut suggested following the efforts the Downtown Task Force has done in *Cityscape*, with announcements and putting in a blank box with the words "watch this space" for information about this program, and after adding new information in several issues, you might receive more participation if you pique their interest. Information should also be added periodically to the City's website. She recalled the Breton Woods development proposed in her neighborhood drew a lot of interest from citizens who were not even adjacent to it because they were interested in what was being proposed. That kind of interest could be kindled, especially when they hear about a proposal that will cause traffic patterns to change, or who just watch what is happening.

Mr. Tracy noted staff had prepared a proposed timeline for this project. The Committee and staff will be developing a proposed amendment over the next month or two, and then presenting the recommendation to the Planning Commission. Initially, they had hoped to have something in front of Council in February or March. That timeline will probably be extended, based on the comments made tonight.

4. CITY OF TIGARD/TRIMET MOU PROGRESS REPORT WITH TRI-MET REPRESENTATIVE

Fred Hanson, TriMet General Manager, noted that in the year since he last met with the Tigard City Council, TriMet has launched a new effort to have more meaningful dialogue with municipalities throughout the service area, especially as TriMet redesigns various routes, adds bus stops or installs bus shelters in the affected jurisdictions. Tigard was the first focus area, and there has been a lot of progress during the past

year. The goal of the Five-Year Transit Investment Program is to work closely together with municipalities as well as coordinate between agencies on numerous projects that might impact one another. When cities install sidewalks or TriMet installs bus shelters, there is an impact on the other agency. There is also a concern that service is provided to the unemployed as well as underemployed citizens, so they have easy transportation access throughout the region. Tigard City Council will consider the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) at an upcoming meeting. The MOU will address a number of mutual concerns of both TriMet and the City of Tigard. Tom Mills of his staff will review the proposed realignment of Line 38 that goes through Tigard.

Mr. Hendryx noted Tigard has had a goal for at least the last nine years of improving transit ridership in Tigard. This commitment is reflected in the MOU, which outlines a number of things. The goal of the Long Range Planning staff will be to implement the MOU. Addressed in the MOU is improved coverage of services, where buses go, transit service and routes, access transit, pedestrian access, shelters, park and ride components, and maximizing ridership. Between the City and TriMet's efforts, the 15-minute corridor will be implemented on Hwy 99, which means there will be a bus running every 15 minutes. The 15-minute corridor is also being considered for Hall Blvd. This MOU represents a substantial commitment by TriMet to Tigard, as well as by Tigard with TriMet, to look at various solutions. The partnership that has been developed through the Capital Improvement Programs will allow sidewalks to be built in many neighborhoods.

Mr. Hendryx noted several accomplishments: The outreach program to serve low income service providers, the commuter rail line continues to move forward, and TriMet's commitment to improve service and install more bus shelters. Planner Duane Roberts has been the City's primary staff person working with TriMet. This afternoon, Mr. Roberts informed him he had just received word from ODOT that funding a sidewalk enhancement program on Hwy. 99W was added to their project list. If approved, \$650,000 will be provided for sidewalk improvements in FY 2006-08. TriMet also worked with the City on the media benches that were located at bus stops with advertising on the benches. The company that owned the benches was in violation of City codes, so the benches were removed. The company has been working with Tigard's Engineering Department to install 19 new transit benches with attached trash receptacles, which they will maintain on a weekly basis. The benches will be placed on Hwy. 99 and 72nd Avenue, as well as a few other areas with high ridership.

Tom Mills, TriMet Service Manager, noted he had been meeting with Mr. Roberts and Barbara Shields on a bi-weekly basis. Those meetings have led to stakeholder outreach meetings, including social service agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, Planning Commission, Downtown Task Force, and others. The comments received at

those meetings have been mapped and then presented at an open house a few weeks ago to receive additional comments. He then reviewed the map, which showed existing TriMet service, the 15-minute corridors, and areas where citizens felt there needed to be service. TriMet will take all those comments and run them through their cost/ridership/operational analysis. The analysis involves cost, ridership, relationship between cost and ridership, can it be done, is there a place for buses to turn around and layover, etc.

Mr. Mills noted the proposed areas to serve include:

- Bonita Road and connect to Downtown Tigard.
- Connect the Tualatin Park and Ride and the Bonita area.
- Service the Bull Mountain Road area
- Service to the Barrow road area.

Councilor Sherwood noted she works with low-income residents who are very dependent on bus service to get them to jobs and shopping. Many cannot get jobs if there is no bus service. She is very pleased there is discussion about serving the Bonita Road area as a lot of low-income residents live in that area. She understands there has been a lot of time spent studying the area and finding out where low-income residents reside, so that bus service can possibly be provided to them.

Councilor Wilson stated he felt for a long time that Tigard was underserved by bus service, so he is pleased by the proposal.

Councilor Woodruff stated he was disappointed to hear the commuter rail is being delayed, as well as the amount of time before it is online. He asked if it would be 2007 before the line will be operating.

Mr. Hansen explained that in order for the commuter rail to be constructed, the federal government has to give its approval and appropriate the necessary funds. One thing that is holding up the project is the idea for a commuter rail line to run between two suburban locations, because generally rail lines serve areas between a suburban area and a downtown area. There are questions about the ridership numbers to justify the federal government to pay 50% of the cost. The location of the Cascade Square stop in the Washington Square area is a hard area to serve because there is no easy access to Washington Square. They continue to explore other options for a station as well as a park and ride facility in that location.

Mayor Dirksen stated he looked forward to the opportunity to work with TriMet to improve sidewalk infrastructure as well as accessibility to transit. He requested that TriMet look at serving the Durham Road area, as a line in that area would provide major access to one-quarter of Tigard's area, serve the high school, and provide a link

for those residents to Hwy. 99 and shopping area. He understands the difficulties involved is more than just connecting existing lines, it is a whole new area that is not being served.

Councilor Sherwood noted before Mayor Griffith died a year ago, he had indicated he had dreamed about having a MOU with TriMet to improve service to Tigard.

Mr. Hansen commented the frequent access corridors would mean that the 15-minute service would not just be during peak hours, but also would be running in the evenings and weekends. TriMet has found when there is this kind of service, people use the line all hours of the day and night as well as on weekends. There is a double and triple digit increase in ridership on lines in other areas. There are other areas that are even more challenging than Hwy. 99W, such as McLoughlin Blvd., where it is hard to cross and is not pedestrian friendly. They have found the frequent service has been working well.

Mr. Mills stated he was pleased to hear about ODOT's possible inclusion of funds for the sidewalk improvement program, as it will also help riders who have to walk to bus stops.

Mayor Dirksen thanked Mr. Hansen for his written support of the City's request probably helped as well.

5. REPORT AND DISCUSS RESULTS WITH DOWNTOWN TASK FORCE FROM DOWNTOWN IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMUNITY DIALOGUE EVENTS

Mr. Hendryx noted after Task Force was formed and the 12 members appointed, it was determined that broader involvement was needed, so membership was increased to 24 members. The committee originally started looking at some key projects for the downtown area, especially in light of the commuter rail line planning that was going on. Tigard received a grant from the State for \$127,000 for one year to produce the plan. Mike Marr will provide an update on the dialogue meetings that have occurred. Barbara Shields had noted the dialogue meetings touched a couple hundred citizens directly. In addition to the people who responded to the survey, this issue has touched between 800 and 1,000 people. The upcoming December 4 workshop is an important step in the process, as it will validate the ideas identified in the numerous dialogue meetings. Beginning in March, there will be another series of dialogue meetings where the public will validate the plan and implementation program. Everyone who participated in the fall dialogue meetings and the survey were invited to the December 4 workshop. Councilors and department heads are requested to be participating in the workshop. The Task Force has met with a wide range of community groups, such as Kiwanis, downtown businesses, etc. Members of

the Long Range Planning staff, Barbara Shields, Beth St. Amand, and other staff members, have been very involved in the project.

Mike Marr introduced the Task Force members who were present: Carolyn Barkely, Judy Munro, Martha Bishop, Janice Arave, Marland Henderson, and Ken Dawson.

Mr. Marr stated the Task Force held over two dozen dialogue meetings with various groups. After making a short presentation about the project, they tried to gather ideas about what people thought the downtown should be like in the near future as well as twenty years from now. What he found to be the most interesting was that for the most part, the same information they received 10 years ago during the visioning process was repeated now. In essence, people want downtown Tigard to become a village, a business center, a community center, be pedestrian friendly, safe, and a destination where they can spend time. The Task Force would like to create a plan to encompass all those concerns, but there will need to be a partnership between both the public and private sectors. Many people compared this to the new Bridgeport Village project, which is actually smaller in area than Tigard's downtown area. Street designs will need to be changed, structures redeveloped, property consolidated for the benefit of a developer who will ultimately be found to develop a larger area, and develop an economic development strategy. The Task Force continues to work with the consultant and resolve some discrepancies that have arisen. One idea the Task Force feels is necessary is to set up a Tigard Development Commission, that would function much like the Portland Development Commission, that would carry out the tasks of economic redevelopment, land consolidation, working with developers, and overseeing projects. The one problem is that Tigard does not have the money or staffing to take on the requirements of a Tigard Development Commission.

Ms. Munro stated she has seen a real ground swell of grass roots support for this project. There is a vision in the community that this will actually be built. She feels that excitement can leverage the excitement when they talk with people about how this can occur. The Task Force has recognized the barricades that are there, but if this is going to be done, now is the time to do it.

Ms. Arave noted a lot of people do not understand what is going on, so there needs to be a way to reach more people.

Mayor Dirksen stated Council would like to hear if the Task Force had developed a communication plan to be used to reach more people. Cities have for a long time recognized the problems with communicating with constituents. When Tigard made the decision to convince voters to pass the bond measure for the library, the process that was followed was probably the most successful program of communicating a task to the citizens. The committee working on the library actually got sick of hearing about it, but the City and library supporters pushed on. Even with all the outreach that was

done, even a week before the election, there were some people who asked "what was this about a new library?"

Ms. Barkley stated she almost holds her clients hostage until they hear her whole spiel about the Downtown Plan. The Task Force has worked closely with TriMet on the downtown commuter rail station, and another meeting is scheduled this week to talk about station amenities and how they propose the station to be set up.

Mr. Marr pointed out the Downtown Brochure that was included in the Council packet. This was professionally designed and published at no cost to the City.

There was discussion about how the brochure could be included in the next *Cityscape* that is scheduled to be delivered by the end of November. This would supplement the article in *Cityscape* about the December 4 Downtown Task Force event in the Library Community Room. It was noted the date in the brochure needed to be corrected.

Councilor Wilson suggested starting a public relations campaign now on a Citywide vote to approve an urban renewal district for the downtown area. He noted the Port of Portland sent out information about the importance of railroads to the region. At some point, the Port will be going to the legislature to ask for public meeting to fund private railroads, so they are starting a public campaign now to get the word out to citizens of the region. He felt information in *Cityscape* was just the beginning point, and should not stop until the time of the vote.

Mr. Monahan stated he would check with staff about inserting the brochure in the December/January issue of *Cityscape*. The Task Force was requested to contact the designer to make the change and for permission to reprint the brochure as an insert in *Cityscape*.

Mr. Marr noted the downtown commuter rail line would not be right on Main Street. In addition, TriMet's funding request is not as much as they had hoped, so many of the design concepts developed a year and half ago were dropped. The Task Force created a subcommittee to meet with TriMet representatives to try to salvage some of the design ideas. Jeff Stagletter from PGE attended a Task Force meeting a couple of months ago to talk about street lighting. The proposal TriMet made for lighting the parking area was not an acceptable design.

Mayor Dirksen stated he talked with Joe Walsh, TriMet's final arbiter of what the station designs are going to be, and will be meeting with him soon. He wants to find out if there is something the City can do to supplement what TriMet is willing to do as well as what kind of money it would take to upgrade the station to what Tigard would like it to be.

Councilor Wilson noted he also talked with Steve Ritter who is working on the actual station design, who then sent him a lot of information about products proposed to be used, but he is limited on products to be used.

Mayor Dirksen explained the commuter rail system is already \$20 million over budget. He did not know how much money it would take the upgrade the station to a design Tigard would support. He first needs to get some solid figures on the possible cost before the City would be able to figure out how to approach this.

Councilor Wilson explained that for parking lots, the higher the pole, the more efficiently the light is spread over the area. For poles 12 to 14 feet high where there are pedestrians, less light is spread through the area so more poles are required for lighting. It is not uncommon for parking lots to have higher poles for that reason. This is what TriMet has done in all the other park and ride lots, to use less poles that are higher. He was not offended to see nice decorative lighting on the platforms, but back off on the higher poles in the parking area.

Mayor Dirksen pointed out the designs the Task Force was presented was a more traditional design for the station, which was basically a round pole with a couple of boxes on top. Mr. Walsh stated the more traditional fixtures tend to be less efficient than the modern fixture, and when the lights are higher in the air, it becomes more difficult to use more traditional looking fixtures. This is something he will be talking more with Mr. Walsh.

Mayor Dirksen noted he is a member of both the Task Force and the City Council. One concern expressed repeatedly by the public is that they want a place or places in the downtown area to be used as a gathering place, a plaza, where people can congregate. This is a perfect opportunity to include this into the plan for the Downtown area. Another concern is the need to include private development into the Downtown Plan. He feels there needs to be projects identified and the City take on the task of a couple of public projects, while also encouraging private redevelopment. There may also need to be public/private partnerships on some projects. He stated he was bringing this up now because the City is going to be called upon to make that financial investment.

Councilor Sherwood stated she feels this has Council's support, but there needs to be a plan before money can be allocated for such a project. Councilor Moore stated Council learned from the past that there has to be something physical to look at in order to share with the public and draw support.

Councilor Woodruff noted there is growing enthusiasm that something is going to happen in the downtown area, and that citizens are looking for substantial change, not

just tweaking or making a cosmetic change, but something really different from what it is now. Other communities have some great examples they have accomplished. He feels there is a lot of support by the public.

Mr. Marr stated when he looked at the City budget as he was preparing for this meeting, he wondered where are the dollars to do this without forming an urban renewal district.

Mayor Dirksen noted if someone knew a better way than an urban renewal district, he hoped they would have spoken up already. That has not been the case, so he felt the urban renewal district would be the best option.

Ms. Barkley stated one problem with the urban renewal district is that it will require a Citywide vote to approve an urban renewal district, which is why the City has not already proposed one.

Councilor Wilson stated he didn't know anyone who would oppose it, but the problem is people would vote no because they would think if the district was formed, it would increase their taxes. Councilor Moore stated that was happened the last time it was proposed. Ms. Barkley noted it would be difficult to educate the citizens any differently. Councilor Wilson suggested starting now, but there needs to be a plan ready to unveil when the discussion starts.

Mr. Marr noted citizens are interested in the Downtown Plan, and it will be hard to maintain that interest for two, three, or four years before the City decides it has enough money to do a major project.

Mayor Dirksen noted that until the plan is in place, the City cannot commit to anything that might be contrary to the overall plan. He hoped that once the plan is completed and unveiled, the City would be able to really move on it.

Mr. Marr stated he was loosing confidence the consultants will have a preliminary plan by February. He hoped money for a couple of items could be plugged into the CIP list even if the project is not fully identified. The Task Force has asked the consultant, but he did not feel they are moving along fast enough to be able to identify a specific project.

Mr. Monahan asked what kind of money might be needed. If the Task Force is talking about including projects in the capital improvement program, it might be possible to plug some money in the upcoming CIP program. It would need to be discussed with City Engineer Gus Duenas so the proposal could be included in the CIP process that will have public review next spring. It may be difficult to include any this coming year given there is no plan yet. He noted the major sources of revenue for

the downtown area might be tax increment financing, as well as a percentage set aside from capital improvement projects.

Ms. Barkley asked when Burnham Street is scheduled to be improved. Mr. Monahan explained it is not scheduled until 2007-08, but if there is a lot of support, it might be able to be moved up in the CIP. That project had been identified as part of a larger program.

Mayor Dirksen noted the Downtown Plan identified a short list of projects, which included the Ash Street connection from Burnham to the railroad right of way.

Mr. Marr asked if the City could begin discussions with ODOT and the railroad about obtaining right-of-way for the crossing of Ash Street over the railroad tracks. He has been told this might be on hold because of discussion about the Wall Street project. He felt the Ash Street crossing is a critical piece for the downtown area.

Mayor Dirksen noted that required a formal application process, which would take several years to prepare.

Mr. Monahan explained when the City talked to ODOT about the Wall Street project, the City was informed they needed a complete design of the entire Wall Street facility before they would even consider the request. The design is finally to a point where ODOT agreed to begin some meetings to discuss the proposed project. Last summer during the budget session, there was concern expressed about the Ash Street connection, and whether it was included in the Transportation System Plan. He asked if there has been enough discussion so that will not be an issue if it was placed on the CIP project list.

Mr. Marr noted the Ash Street Corridor would run from Burnham to Scoffins, with a long-term plan to connect Ash Street to tie into Hunziker. He noted this corridor would provide the circulation the downtown area is lacking. He noted when this proposal was discussed, there were some negative comments presented, especially by the residents who would be directly affected. However, most of the community sees the Ash Street corridor as being reasonable.

Mr. Monahan noted Ms. Barkley had indicated the rest of the community might not be aware of what is proposed for the downtown area. ODOT may indicate the only way this would be feasible is if Ash were to connect with Walnut. It will be interesting to find out if ODOT supports the signalization of Hall and Wall.

Mr. Marr stated he felt the entire Ash Street issue needs to be addressed as part of the downtown village concept.

Ms. Barkley stated she has talked a number of times to Angelo of Angelo's Catering as well as Carl and Forest Johnson, and others who might be impacted. They are concerned about relocating. Angelo just put a lot of money renovating his building. There have been concerns expressed about how they might be impacted as a result of passage of Ballot Measure 37.

Mr. Henderson noted the consultants presented a market analysis about this area, which he suggested the Councilors also review. The last market analysis was completed 15 years ago, and he thought the new material contained a lot of good information. He noted the December 4 meeting would be a great opportunity to provide a lot of information to the public about the Downtown Plan and what the Task Force has been involved with. The consultant is working on the feasibility information as well as financial information. The Task Force has been requested to begin putting projects together even before there is a plan ready to be submitted. He felt the December 4 meeting would be a real eye opener to the public.

Mayor Dirksen noted the press release about the December 4 meeting was issued today. It was noted the Chamber of Commerce would also send information about this meeting to their members, especially business owners.

Mr. Monahan asked if Mike Stephenson could make the change to the brochure that was discussed earlier and get permission to reprint the brochure in the *Cityscape*. Ms. Arave stated they would try.

Councilor Woodruff noted there has not been much discussion about what will happen if the urban renewal project is not approved. The small amount of money set aside for Wall Street is not as important as doing something in the downtown area. He asked if funds for Wall Street could be used in the downtown area. Mr. Monahan explained funds for the Wall Street project was included as part of the library levy, and those funds cannot be reallocated to some other project.

Mr. Marr stated it was frustrating to see \$500,000 sitting there in the budget for the Wall Street/Hall Blvd. intersection and signal, when there are a number of projects in the downtown area that would cost \$15,000 to \$20,000 each.

Mr. Monahan responded the City is following the directions of the voters relating to the library levy. The City had a very successful campaign to receive approval to build the library. The whole idea for the Library Levy was that the money for the library and other improvements would be done in accordance with what was proposed in the ballot measure, and the community would see the results and give authority for something else in the future.

Councilor Sherwood asked if it would be possible to combine the tax increment financing and this project at the same election, or would it have to be on different election dates. Mr. Monahan replied he thought both issues could be placed on the same ballot, and possibly even the same measure. That is something staff will have to investigate.

Mr. Hendryx noted the Task Force has done an excellent job and recognized the number of meetings that has been held to reach this point. There were numerous dialogue meetings with many groups to get their input. The December meeting is a critical point in this discussion and noted the momentum that has been building in the community. The dialogue meetings to be held in the spring are also critical, and hoped the momentum will continue into next summer at which time it is hoped an urban renewal district could be approved. This will take a concerted effort by the Task Force, the City staff and Council to achieve that.

Councilor Sherwood noted she attended a Washington County meeting about a proposed Hwy. 217 corridor project, and asked if there was a way the City's project could connect to that effort.

Mr. Hendryx explained Washington County is looking at forming an urban renewal district, which would run from Hwy. 26 (Sunset Highway) to Tigard. He noted there would need to be a vote by Tigard residents to be included in Washington County's urban renewal district as required by City Charter. Council will eventually have to agree whether the portion of that project located in the City will be included with the rest of the Washington County project. Washington County is currently conducting a feasibility study, which will be discussed at their Policy Task Force next Monday. He noted it might be financially advantageous for Tigard to combine with Washington County's effort, as it would lower the administrative costs to be part of their program.

Councilor Wilson noted he had talked with County Chair Tom Brian yesterday, who indicated there might be an opportunity to obtain federal funds for their project. Mr. Brian was proposing that it would be a good idea for Tigard to join the rest of the project, not that they were trying to take over Tigard's project, but where they could help Tigard. He explained any urban renewal district for Tigard would require approval by Tigard voters. Mr. Brian indicated he was aware of that, and Washington County's County Counsel is looking into that issue.

Mr. Henderson stated he had also heard Mr. Brian's proposal. As Mr. Brian explained it to him, Tigard would benefit a lot from being part of the Washington County program as Tigard is one of the most depressed areas of Washington County. The whole urban renewal district from Hwy. 26 to Tigard would benefit from the consolidated project.

Mr. Marr stated he felt the County's plan could be part of Tigard's funding scenario.

Councilor Wilson noted the only vote that would be required would be for Tigard to approve being included in the County's urban renewal agency, as required by Tigard's charter. The rest of the project did not require any vote by Beaverton or Washington County. By being included with the County plan, Tigard would receive federal money, money from the County, and potentially funds from other jurisdictions as part of the larger urban renewal district.

Mr. Monahan stated that if Tigard chose to do any urban renewal district by itself, it would be a hard sell. If Tigard's project is consolidated with Washington County, the resulting urban renewal area is larger. He thought two plans would have to be sent to Tigard voters: the boundaries of the Downtown Plan, and the area outside the downtown area, which would be part of the corridor plan.

Councilor Moore stated he feels the cart has been placed before the horse. There needs to be a plan to be shared with the voters, but now funding issues are being discussed. It seems the discussion is hopping all over the place. He believes that once the plan is complete, funding will follow. He has been on the Council for nine years, and if not careful, it will be another nine years before anything is done. However, this is headed in the right direction.

Ms. Barkley explained her concern was this Committee was working very hard on a plan for downtown, and if Washington County proposes an urban renewal district at the same time and she is concerned what the impacts might be on the City's Downtown Plan. She would not want to see the City's Downtown Plans aborted because Washington County was proposing its corridor plan.

Councilor Moore stated the Downtown Plan is what the City has control over. He does not know anything about Washington County's proposal.

Councilor Woodruff commented the City is committed that these efforts not fall apart.

Councilor Moore stated this would involve public relations and public information/education of the public about the plan and then the financing plan.

6. SKATE PARK UPDATE

Mr. Koellermeier noted members of the Skate Park Task Force and one member of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board were present tonight. He explained this is an update of where the skate park is, and the Task Force has looked at some of the

physical issues of siting as well as funding issues. The following are issues to update the Council on the status of the skate park:

Site - Mr. Koellermeier noted Council had authorized the Task Force to move ahead with the concept of building a skate park in the City Hall parking lot. The Task Force has worked with staff, consultant and a skate park builder on a plan. One issue that was faced was the impact of the skate park on parking needs at City Hall. City's codes and rules were reviewed and a very unscientific study of impact conducted by roping off the area that would be used by the skate park. The results from the unscientific study probably provided more information than any scientific study that could have been conducted. There has been a compromise agreed to by the Skate Park Task Force and staff to reduce the size of the skate park to 15,000 square feet, rectangular in shape, which will preserve more parking area. The Task Force members will probably indicate their concerns that this is too small a facility. The initial proposed skate park was going to be 25,000 square feet. The proposal that has been agreed upon is to build the first 15,000 square feet in such a way that the next component can be tied in with the first area sometime in the future.

Community Support – The Skate Park issue was addressed in two recent surveys – the Parks and Recreation Survey and the Vision Survey. Both included results about the level of community support for this facility. In the Parks & Recreation Survey, 43% of the people favored a skate park using City funds, while 49% were opposed to the use of City funds. There were four statements in the Visioning Survey that directly supported the skate park out of 409 surveys returned.

Fund Raising – The Task Force has raised approximately \$10,000 right now. The Task Force met with a skate park builder, Dreamland, who is recognized as the premier skate park builder in the local area. Dreamland provided information about what a skate park of this size would cost, which was \$529,000. Another proposal received indicated the cost between \$400,000 and \$500,000. The staff and Task Force, for planning purposes, felt the use of the higher number of \$529,000 would be safer in the long run to shoot for.

Funding – The Task Force and staff are aware Council's previous position was not committing any public funding to construction of this facility. The Task Force has looked at many combinations and sources, including private funding, forming a 501(3)(c) organization, private grants, donation, public grant opportunities, and a combination of all of those. The conclusion was that a combination of sources would be the solution to get the skate park built at this time.

This all boils down to a policy question for Council. The Task Force and staff has worked very hard and came to a consensus position that if this is to be built in the foreseeable future, it would be necessary to ask Council to endorse application for a

public grant and approving the local match that most grants require. Fundraising will still continue. Several people feel that the skate park should be included in the community park section of the SDC. Others feel that skate parks should not be eligible for SDC funds.

Conclusion – This boils down to a policy call by Council. The course of action staff recommends in order to keep this program going and moving toward building a skate park in the foreseeable future is to:

- 1) Agree to reduce the size of the skate park to 15,000 square feet at this time with the design to accommodate future expansion into the area of the Niche facility.
- 2) Continue to move ahead with public funding. Staff believes the use of SDC dollars would be the way to go and in order to do that, Council would need to designate skate parks to be a community park in the new SDC methodology and policy which Council will be considering next week. If Council approves that designation of skate parks being a community park, then staff could include funding for the skate park in the next budget cycle.
- 3) Authorize staff to apply for public grant. Staff received updated information today that the application would be due next month. However, Park Manager Dan Plaza found that the grant with the December deadline has a lower threshold of grant awards, while the April cycle grants are higher of \$150,000. Staff would recommend holding off submitting a grant request until the April cycle.

Mr. Plaza noted the grants staff was considering are quite competitive. In the past, the local government grant the City would be applying for generally approves at least one or two grants for skate parks.

Mr. Koellermeier explained the other piece of the puzzle is the balance of approximately \$105,000, which would be the fund raising obligation of the Task Force. He noted another concern since the last time Council talked about this is whether Council wants to commit staff time toward fund raising activities.

Councilor Sherwood noted Tualatin's skate park fund raising effort was successful because their mayor and council were very supportive and involved in the fund raising effort.

Mr. Koellermeier introduced the Task Force members who were present: Pat Biggs, Mary Van Domelin, Connie Ramekers, Barry Albertson, Rich Carlson, and Sally Harding.

Mr. Monahan noted that Tualatin's Skate Park was mentioned. At last night's Joint meeting with the City of Tualatin and the Tigard/Tualatin School District Board, Tualatin explained their fund raising program for their skate park. Mr. Koellermeier alluded to the availability of Park SDC's for skate parks. Tualatin did not use their Park SDCs for their skate park, as it was not included in uses eligible for Park SDC funds. That was the reason Mr. Koellermeier suggested that Tigard add skate parks to the list of community parks so it would be being eligible for using Park SDC funds. He distributed an e-mail message from Paul Hennon, which described the City of Tualatin's fund raising program. (Agenda Item No. 6, Exhibit #1).

Mr. Koellermeier noted Council will be considering a revised Park SDC methodology and rates next week and in December, which will raise Parks SDC more than 100% on new construction. There will be more funds available for this type of expenditure.

Mr. Carlson stated there is no question the Task Force has been high-centered for a period of time. The experience of other cities is interesting. Tualatin's skate park is 10,000 square feet, and Newburg's is the granddaddy of them all with 30,000 square feet. Both Tualatin and Newburg have indicated that if they had it to do over, they would have made their skate parks bigger. Tigard's park of 15,000 square feet is going to be bigger than Tualatin's and will receive more usage than Tualatin's. At some point, Tigard is going to say the skate park should have been larger. At this point, all that can be afforded is 15,000 square feet. That is a good compromise, and helps get this project off dead center.

Mr. Carlson noted that there is community support. He was surprised when he read the survey question, "If an election were held today, would you favor or oppose a \$400,000 bond measure to construct a skate park?" He did not feel people were asked if they supported the use of City funds, but instead if they would approve a special bond measure for a skate park. He noted that 43% of the responders said "yes," which he feels represents a lot of community support. Less than 25% of the City's residents have kids in school, but 43% of the population said they were willing to pay extra out of their pocket for a skate park. He went through Dan Plaza's press clipping file and found that three years ago, November 2001, the first meeting was held concerning the possibility of building a skate park, and there was a lot of people who attended that meeting. He believes the goal was that it was important to have a skate park in Tigard, which is how this Task Force was created.

Mr. Carlson noted skateboard and in-line skating is the fastest growing sport in the country. In Oregon, over 60 parks have been built, many in cities and towns much smaller than Tigard. The City of Portland is planning to build 20 skate parks in the next few years.

Mr. Carlson noted it took 1-1/2 years before the City Council got to the point of agreeing the skate park could be built in the City Hall parking lot. The Task Force looked at many other locations, including schools and parks, but all were controversial. There has been a lot of enthusiasm, and some of the initial supporters have dropped out, to be replaced by others. Originally, he thought the fund raising was going to be a lot easier to do, but they have found there are not many people willing to really put the time needed into this project. This group of busy volunteers is all willing to take the time to do this. He discussed the possibility to moving forward with a bond measure next May. He believes the fundraising can be done and the skate park constructed.

Ms. Biggs stated the group lost one of their biggest fundraisers, when Al Heib died a little over a month ago. Mr. Heib had contacts in the business community, so this group needs to work on contacting the business community. She noted Newburg's skate park is used 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and it is not just a kid's sport any more. The reason each one of the Task Force members are here is because they support kids. She served on the school board for many years after her youngest child graduated from high school. She then described the cost it takes to build and maintain football fields, tracks, soccer fields, gymnasiums for basketball and volleyball, as well as the costs for band and choir. All these programs have the physical plant, as well as coaches, uniforms, maintenance of facilities, which are on an ongoing basis. A skate park does not require coaches, uniforms, or much maintenance. Basically it is a one-time cost of approximately \$500,000 to build the skate park. She talked about the fund raising efforts for the swimming pool, the soccer fields, track, stadiums, and other athletic complexes.

Councilor Moore stated he believed the Council felt the skate park is a worthwhile project. The City Council approved the use of the parking lot for a skate park. The bottom line is, does the City have \$150,000 to contribute to the construction of the skate park.

Councilor Woodruff asked the Task Force members how practical it would be to raise \$105,000 when it has taken three years to raise \$10,000. Ms. Van Domelin stated the Task Force will be more aggressive at fund raising, but for some time they were not sure they had a site, what it would cost, and the Task Force needed a lot more information before they felt it was feasible to do a lot of fund raising.

Councilor Moore stated he would like to see how much support there actually is from the community. He is concerned about applying for a grant, the City providing matching funds, ear marking Park SDC funds for the project, and then finding out the fund raising effort is lacking, so the City is asked to step in with more money so the project can be built. He was looking to see if there was really overwhelming community support and funds coming in to indicate community support.

Councilor Sherwood asked if the City commits the funds, would it be easier to raise the funds. Would it be easier to raise the \$105,000 first and then come to the Council. Ms. Van Domelin responded there would be community support if the City Council were first really behind this project.

Councilor Wilson asked if the grant staff would be applying for requires a matching grant. Mr. Koellermeier stated the grant requires a local match. They plan to submit a grant in the April cycle. Traditionally in the past, when grants have been applied for, the City has to specifically state it has approved funding the matching funds.

Mr. Monahan noted the money the City received for Cook Park was from Lottery Funds from the State Parks and Recreation Department. The reason the City successfully received that \$250,000 was because it was shown there was a partnership with the community, including the soccer and baseball leagues. When the City made their presentation, representatives from the various leagues and community groups went with the City representatives. The reason he brings this up is the granting agency needs to know there is a fund raising effort going on and that the City has made a commitment of funds should the state funding be approved. All these components are necessary as part of the grant application.

Mr. Albertson noted there are private foundations that other groups can apply to which the City is not eligible as it is a taxing authority. Grants to the private foundations need to know if the City supports the project and they want to see that support up front. Support has to be stated up front, not after the fact, because the foundations want to see if there is real community support besides the fund raising effort.

Mr. Albertson asked what kind of funds could be expected from Park SDCs for the skate park. Last night, Chris Bergstrom noted that when the City of Tualatin was raising funds for their skate park, while it was a grass roots effort, it included a lot of support from the Mayor and City Council. It was noted this was a very important part of the community's support.

Councilor Woodruff stated some citizens might be concerned with spending \$500,000 for what they see as a slab of concrete. The Task Force members are the ones who have done the research and understand what is reasonable and what it costs. That information needs to be shared with the community. He noted the Vision Survey asked responders to rate projects they would be willing to spend public money on, and skate parks were at the very bottom of the list. This is a big concern because so many people did not feel public money should be spent on a skate park. At this time, he would be hard pressed to commit public money to a skate park, especially if the fund raising effort does not work out.

Mr. Albertson stated this is where leadership comes in and felt the City Council should say the public was wrong and this is where money needs to be spent.

Ms. Van Domelin stated she has attended meetings with Rob Bojanick and Mary Rose Navarro of the City of Portland Parks and Recreation Department who work almost full time on skate parks. In their view, skate parks have a negative stigma attached to the sport, so they began an education campaign to change a negative attitude to a positive one. One program they have is posters in the elevators at the Portland Building promoting skate parks. This was one thing she hoped to gain tonight is for the Councilors to become proponents of this skate park and to indicate this will be a positive amenity for the City.

Councilor Wilson stated he is a landscape architect and has designed several skate parks. He noted that for a tiny neighborhood park with a play structure, the cost is \$70,000, which is built all the time. He recently designed two skate parks, one in Hillsboro and the other in Forest Grove. They day the Hillsboro Skate Park opened, there were 200 kids there. Some kids ride the bus from Tigard and Beaverton so they could use that skate park. The reason skate parks are so expensive is they are thick concrete at 4000 psi, are loaded with steel, and the finishing has to be perfect or they are not skate-able. The two skate parks he was involved with have heavy usage. Compared to a tennis court where only two or four people can play at a time, which costs \$50,000, a skate park is about 10 times the size of a tennis court but used by 200 people at a time. This is a perception issue. Mayor Jim Griffith was a staunch supporter of the skate park. He came on Council in the middle of the discussion and has been surprised the City would not spend a dime on it. One question he has, if the City Council agrees to put \$100,000 or \$150,000 into this, what projects would be displaced.

Mr. Koellermeier responded the City is committed to programming and planning, and the emphasis has been on trails. Regarding the list of parks that are identified, the General Fund portion for Northview Park Development is \$90,000 and \$30,000 for Jack Park but they do not qualify for SDC's funds. The same applies to the next four park projects. He did not believe any existing project would be displaced if Council decided to use Park SDC funds for the skate park.

Mr. Plaza concurred he also did not see any projects being displaced on the Parks SDC list should the skate park be added to the list. He noted Council will hold a hearing November 23 on the Park SDC methodology and rates and if adopted, the rates would go into effect January 1, 2005. There will be between \$400,000 and \$1 million in SDC fees collected annually. He had confirmed these figures with the consultant to be sure.

Mr. Koellermeier stated the real issue that will slow development on other projects such as the six park projects he mentioned is the funding that is not SDC eligible.

Mr. Plaza said there are \$250,000 in projects that are SDC eligible but do not have the funds for the other portion. The other portion needs to be from a variety of funds such as general fund or grants, or a possible bond measure. Jack Park project needs \$30,000 and Northview Park needs \$90,000 from other sources, and those funds are just not available.

Mr. Koellermeier stated the question he needed Council's direction on is, *Does the Council want to use their grant application authority to apply for a grant to be used for the skate park, and what projects might lose their non-SDC component be offset if the grant for the skate park is successful?* If the City were successful in a grant for \$150,000 for the skate park, what happens if the well runs dry for other projects. Tigard has been very lucky in being awarded grants, but we probably will not get more than one or two a year, so is the skate park a high priority?

Mr. Monahan stated he recalled when the City was looking at state funds from the Trust for Public Lands, the Council decided it could submit the application but Council had a certain amount of time to decide whether to accept the funding. Theoretically if we knew what date that was, perhaps waiting to see if the grant applications were successful that Mr. Albertson was applying for, as well as fund raising efforts, before the City had to commit its funds.

Mr. Plaza indicated that if Mr. Albertson was successful in getting private foundation money, there is a chance the grants might be significant enough that less SDC money would be required. In addition, if the fund raising were successful, it would mean less than \$150,000 would be needed from the City.

Ms. Biggs asked if the skate park (15,000 square feet) was going to be built with the design intent built in that it could be enlarged to 25,000 square feet. Mr. Koellermeier stated he could not say at this time.

Councilor Moore noted the City Hall Parking lot is worth a certain amount of money and asked if that fact will be noted in the grant application, so the granting agency knows the City does not have to go out to buy property for the skate park, that the site is already available.

Mr. Monahan replied that is a beneficial component, but that cannot be used as the City's match. Councilor Moore stated it showed the City's support though.

Mr. Albertson noted that when the grant application is prepared, that information is included in the application. That information would particularly be favorable to private foundations, because the land does have value.

Councilor Woodruff asked if the school district would be allocating any funds for the skate park. Mr. Albertson indicated the School District has not been asked to allocate any funds. Mr. Carlson stated the School District donated \$5,000 to the Tualatin Skate Park.

Councilor Sherwood asked what Council needs to do tonight. Mr. Koellermeier stated he needed to know from Council if the staff is authorized to apply for this grant.

Ms. Harding stated the City uses SDC's for trails, and some program is needed to support kids. She noted she grew up in Tigard when there was not much development and there were places for kids to go to hang out. Kids do not have that today. Her son went to live with his dad in Tualatin when Tigard officials told her she could not have a basketball hoop on the street. When her son lived in Tualatin, he was constantly over at their skate park. As Councilor Elect, she attended the recent League of Oregon Cities meeting. She heard a lot of people talking about other cities building who have and are building skate parks, so she asked how they did it. The number one answer she was given was that the project needed the Mayor and Council's support.

Councilor Woodruff noted that no real decision is needed tonight, but staff needed to know whether there would be strong Council support for funding the local match.

Mr. Monahan noted this will be helpful, especially because the Park SDC methodology will be the subject of a public hearing next week, and staff needs to know if a skate park would be an allowable expenditure of SDCs.

Councilor Woodruff stated he felt Council was in support of that, but he did not want fund raising to stop just because the City would allow expenditures from Parks SDC's on skate parks.

Mr. Monahan noted from the conversation, he feels

- staff can return next week and make skate parks an allowable expenditure of Park SDC's,
- that Council is supportive of applying for a grant for the skate park construction;
- that Council will need to approve a letter of support at the time the grant application is to be filed that it commits funds for the skate park.

Ms. Ramekers stated she works with many kids at her job at the school district, and many get stereotyped. The majority of kids is great and need something to do. The skate park will be used a lot. She noted the upcoming pop can/bottle drive in December.

Ms. Harding stated that if you look at the City Newsletter, *Cityscape*, the number of times the library had full court press, and more than just the front page. The skate park has only had a paragraph here and there, generally on page 5 or 6. She asked that *Cityscape* be used to provide an educational piece about the skate park.

Mr. Carlson urged a representative from the City Council attend the Task Force meetings. Mr. Plaza used to attend, but there has not been any City representation for some time. Their meetings are held on Monday nights because it was felt this might be one night Councilors would be able to attend.

Councilor Elect Harding indicated she would like to serve as liaison to the Skate Park Task Force.

7. COUNCIL GOAL SETTING DISCUSSION

Mr. Monahan noted that Council goal setting is generally held in January. The first meeting in January is on the 11th, and goal setting is held after that. He had two proposed dates: January 17, which is Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, is a City holiday, so City facilities would be available. January 18 would be the normal Council workshop, but Council could begin meeting at noon, break for dinner and continue into the evening if necessary. Council could also consider a weekend activity.

Councilor Sherwood asked if the meeting could be held out of town.

Mr. Monahan stated it could but would involve more details and a lot more expense, as well as running into problems with the public. During the past few years, Council has had very productive half-day sessions where members of the public have also participated. The City has received positive feedback from the public saying that it is great seeing the Council work on issues like it did, because this does not happen in other meetings.

Councilor Woodruff stated he supports the half-day on January 18 beginning at noon and going into the evening if necessary. Other Councilors indicated they concurred.

Mayor Dirksen asked Councilors to check their calendars and to let him know if they are not available on January 18.

8. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORTS

Councilor Moore stated since he has 1-1/2 months left on Council, he was concerned about the liaison to the four water related boards he serves on, including the Willamette River Water Consortium, Regional Water Provider Consortium, Intergovernmental Water Board and the AWC. He does not participate on the Portland water negotiations as that is strictly on staff level. Some of those meetings are held quarterly, monthly, bi-monthly, or as needed.

Mr. Monahan said he would provide Council with the most current liaison assignment list. In addition, he had asked staff to write up information about each assignment, indicating what each are all about, the time commitment required, where meetings take place, but have not received that information from staff yet. His intention was to bring that information to the January goal setting session.

Councilor Moore stated it might not be necessary to appoint anyone for the next 1-1/2 months. When he took over these assignments, he spent between 1 and 1-1/2 hours talking with staff about each organization. Maybe that would be all that would be required. Mr. Koellermeier has been great to keep him up to date about the water issues.


Mr. Monahan stated he could ask Mr. Koellermeier to prepare the descriptions of those four assignments. Anyone who takes these four assignments probably should not take on too many other tasks, because the days and times of meetings vary, and will almost prohibit anyone from taking on many other assignments.

Councilor Moore stated there would be a lot of involvement on the Joint Water Commission after the first of the year as they begin a public participation outreach program. Another matter he has been involved with is the Visioning Task Force for Transportation, which Gus Duenas supports.


9. NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Councilor Woodruff, seconded by Councilor Sherwood, and unanimously carried, to adjourn the meeting at 10:11 p.m.


Jane McGarvin, Deputy City Recorder

Attest:


Mayor, City of Tigard

Date: 1.11.05